UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,492	06/18/2001	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010543US1	4149

7590 11/19/2004	EXAMINER
Duke W. Yee	VU, THANH T
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/884,492	BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanh T. Vu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 June 2004</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
     1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
     2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
     3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, Filed 06/14/2004.

Claims 1-48 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 1, 12, 17, 19, 22-25, 36, 43, 46-48 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 22, 25-30, 32-35, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddalozzo, Jr. et al. ("Maddalozzo" U.S. Pat. No. 6,012,093) and Gupta et al. ("Gupta"U.S..Pat. No. 6,487,538).

As per independent **claim 1**, Maddalozzo teaches a method in a data processing system for managing a history for a browser, the method comprising: recording a history for a browser (Abstract), but does not specifically teach selectively exporting a portion of the history for use by another program or computer system. However, Gupta teaches selectively exporting a portion of the history for use by another program or computer system (col. 6, lines 31-45; col. 9, lines 52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include exporting of information as taught by Gupta in the invention of Maddalozzo because it is desirable for advertisements to target specific audiences and persons that may be interested in the specific good and service being advertised.

As per **claims 2 and 3**, which are dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the

portion covers a period of time for a session (col.4, lines 6-9)

As per **claim 4 and 5**, which are dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches presenting

the portion of the history wherein the portion includes a set of Web pages visited during the

period of time (Abstract, Fig.5, step 5114).

As per **claim 6**, which is dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches displaying a

graphical representation of the history; and receiving user input to select the portion of the

history (Fig.5, col.5, lines 6-7).

As per **claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 6, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the

paphical representation is in a form of a set of entries in a window (Fig.4, col.4, lines 39-40).

As per **claims 9 and 10**, which are dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo discloses wherein

the recording step is initiated in response to a begirming of a browser session and the recording

step terminates in response to a termination of the browsing session (col.3, lines 32-38, lines 66-

67; col.4, lines 1-3)

As per **claim 11**, which is dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the

recording step is initiated in response to a user input (col.4, lines 6-9).

Claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Furthermore, Maddalozzo

teaches a bus system, a communication unit connected to the bus system, and a memory

connected to the bus system wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (fig. 2; col. 3,

lines 1-11).

Claims **25-30 and 32-35** are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-6 and 8-11

respectively.

Claim 46 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claims 12-18, 23, 36-42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Maddalozzo, Jr. et al. ("Maddalozzo" U.S. Pat. No. 6,012,093) and MS

Internet Explorer.

As per **claim 12**, Maddalozzo teaches a method in a data processing system for logging

browsing activities for a browser, the method comprising:

logging Web pages visited using the browser to form a log (col.4, lines 6-9), presenting

the log (col.4, lines 13-16), and receiving a selection of a portion of the log (col.4, line 14), but

does not specifically teach deleting said portion of said log in response to receiving the selection.

However, MS Internet Explorer teaches deleting said portion of said log in response to receiving

the selection (figs. 1 and 2; item # 10 and 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include deleting of history files as taught

by MS Internet Explorer in the invention of Maddalozzo in order for user to save memory space

and manage the history files.

As per **claim 13**, which is dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the log

includes a plurality of browsing sessions (col.4, lines 42-44).

As per **claim 14**, which is dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the

selection is received from a user input (col.4, line 13-20).

As per **claim 15 and 16**, which is dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein

the log is stored in a storage device located within the remote data processing system

(Fig.8, col.3, lines 17-20).

As per **claims 17 and 18**, which are dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein

the storing step forms a stored log and further comprising: presenting Web pages in the

portion of the log in response to an event of a user input (col.3, lines 17-30).

Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12. Furthermore, Maddalozzo

teaches a bus system, a communication unit connected to the bus system, and a memory

connected to the bus system wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (fig. 2; col. 3,

lines 1-11).

Claims **36-42** are rejected under the same rationale as claims 12-18 respectively.

Claim 47 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12.

Claims 19-21, 24, 43-45 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Maddalozzo, Jr. et al. ("Maddalozzo" U.S. Pat. No. 6,012,093) and Straub et

al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. ,216,141).

As per **Claim 19**, Maddalozzo teaches a method in data processing system for presenting

a history of browser activities, the method comprising: logging web pages received by a browser

session to form a log (Figs. 3 and 4; col. 3, lines 13-20 and lines 37-45), but does not specifically

teach in response to a request to display said log, sequentially displaying web pages for the log.

However, Straub teaches in response to a request to display said log, sequentially displaying web

pages for the log (col. 9, lines 24-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to include sequentially displaying of files as taught by

Straub in the invention of Maddalozzo in order to provide an user with an automated navigation

controls which the user can use to scan through a list of documents or files.

As per **claim 20**, which is dependent on claim 19, Maddalozzo teaches receiving a user input manipulating presentation for the Web pages (col.3, lines 61-63).

As per **claim 21**, which is dependent on claim 20, Straub teaches wherein the user input is one of a play, fast forward, reverse, or stop (col. 9, lines 24-32).

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Furthermore, Maddalozzo teaches a bus system, a communication unit connected to the bus system, and a memory connected to the bus system wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (fig. 2; col. 3, lines 1-11).

Claims 43-45 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 19-21 respectively.

Claim 48 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12.

Claims 7 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddalozzo, Jr. et al. ("Maddalozzo" U.S. Pat. No. 6,012,093) and Berstis (US 6,243,091).

As per **claims 7 and 31**, Maddalozzo teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claims 6 and 30. However Maddalozzo does not specifically teach wherein the graphical representation is in a form of a tree. Berstis teaches that websites can be organized as tree-like structures (col.1 1, lines 12-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention include the tree structure taught by Berstis in the method as taught by Maddalozzo because the tree data structure is adaptable to represent web pages associated with the information for ease and simplicity of mapping objects within a website.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the Amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100